

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for total consideration given the present application. Claims 1-6 and 11-15 are currently pending of which claims 1 and 11-13 are independent. Claims 1 and 11-13 are amended through this Reply. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejected claims in light of the amendment and remarks presented herein, and earnestly seek timely allowance of all pending claims.

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

Applicants thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview with the Applicants' representative on February 18, 2010. During the interview, Applicants' representative explained the claimed invention and the applicability of the applied prior art references. More specifically, Applicants' representative argued that none of the applied prior art reference, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggest a user ID creating means or step as claimed in independent claims 1 and 11-13. Although Examiner did not necessarily disagree with Applicants' representative's arguments, the Examiner suggested that the independent claims should be amended to positively recite that the user ID is created "*in response to the received electronic mail transmitted from said user*". The Examiner agreed that the above-noted amendment would overcome the outstanding prior art rejection.

AMENDMENT

Although Applicants do not necessarily agree that further amendment is necessary to distinguish the claimed invention from the applied prior art references, independent claims 1 and 11-13 have been amended as agreed upon during the interview. The amendments made to the claims do not add any new matter to the application and do not raise any new issue. This amendment has been made merely to enhance clarity. It is intended that the scope of the claims remain substantially the same. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments made to claims are not narrowing, and are not made for a reason relating to patentability. Accordingly, it is submitted that these amendments do not give rise to estoppel and, in future analysis, claims 1 and 11-13 are entitled to their full range of equivalents.

PRIOR ART REJECTION

In paragraph 5 of the final Office action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-6 and 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046247 A1 to Iwase et al. ("Iwase"), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,877,031 B2 to Watanabe et al. ("Watanabe"), further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138313 to Fujii et al. ("Fujii"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claims 1 and 11-13 have been amended to recite, *inter alia*, "*in response to the received electronic mail transmitted from said user*". As acknowledged by the Examiner during the telephone interview of February 18, 2010, none of the applied prior art references, either alone or in combination, teaches or suggests the above-identified feature of claims 1 and 11-13. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

CONCLUSION

All rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claims does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Ali M. Imam Reg. No. 58,755 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: March 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Chad J. Billings

Registration No.: 48,917

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatchouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants